Case 4:08-cv-02874-CW Document 23 Filed 12/05/08 Page 1 of 2

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Ronald F. Remmel (#87628) rremmel@newtonremmel.com Lenell Topol McCallum (#84024) Imccallum@newtonremmel.com NEWTON REMMEL A Professional Corporation 1451 Grant Road, P.O. Box 1059 Mountain View, CA 94042 Telephone: (650) 903-0500 Facsimile: (650) 967-5800 Attorneys for Defendant FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION		
11			
12	SECOND WALNUT CREEK MUTUAL,) Case No.: CV08-28	374 CW
13 14	Plaintiff,	MOTION TO DIS	NG DEFENDANTS' MISS FOR FAILURE AIM UPON WHICH
15 16 17 18	TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY COMPANY OF AMERICA, FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, Defendants.	 RELIEF CAN BE 12(b)(6)) Hearing Date: Time: Courtroom: 	November 6, 2008 2:00 p.m. 2
19	The Court has considered the motion of Defendants Travelers Property Casualty		
20	Company of America and Federal Insurance Company to dismiss the complaint of plaintiff		
21	Second Walnut Creek Mutual, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), along with		
22	the stipulation executed by plaintiff and defendants granting the motion to dismiss.		
2324	Upon having considered the written arguments of defendants and the stipulation of all		
25	parties granting the motion to dismiss, and good cause appearing, the Court rules and orders as		
26	follows:		
27	1. Defendants' motion to dismiss p	laintiff's Complaint fo	or Breach of Contract,
28	Breach of Implied Covenant Of Good Faith And Fair Dealing, Declaratory		
	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS - 1		

Case 4:08-cv-02874-CW Document 23 Filed 12/05/08 Page 2 of 2

Relief And Punitive Damages, with prejudice, is granted on the grounds that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Defendants' denial of the costs incurred by plaintiff to repair the underground portion of the plumbing system was proper because those costs are excluded under the involved insurance policy, which is attached to the Complaint, and there has been no breach of contract as a matter of law. Furthermore, since the denial of coverage was proper, the facts do not support a claim for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing or punitive damages as a matter of law.

	12/5/08
DATED:	

CLAUDIA WILKEN
JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT